

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALBERTO D. ROBLEDO and ALICIA H.
ROBLEDO,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CHASE BANK; RECONVAYANCE COMPANY,
N.A.; MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC
REGISTRATION SYSTEM, INCORPORATION,

Defendants.

No. C 11-1292 CW

ORDER CONCERNING
PLAINTIFFS'
OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO DISMISS

On April 25, 2011, JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., erroneously sued as Chase Bank; California Reconveyance Company, erroneously sued as Reconveyance Company; and Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., erroneously sued as Mortgage Electronic Registration System, Incorporation moved to dismiss Plaintiffs Alberto D. Robledo and Alicia H. Robledo's complaint.¹ Because Defendants' motion was set for hearing on June 2, 2011, Plaintiffs' opposition was due May 12, 2011. Civ. L.R. 7-3(a). No response from Plaintiffs was received.

Within seven days of the date of this Order, Plaintiffs shall respond to Defendants' motion. Any opposition must contain comprehensible arguments that respond substantively to Defendants'

¹ Plaintiffs' complaint also lists "David-Wynn Miller, Plenipotentiary-Judge (witnessing)" as a "Claimant." However, he does not appear to be a Plaintiff in this action because neither he nor an attorney on his behalf has signed the complaint.

1 motion.² If Plaintiffs respond, Defendants shall reply seven days
2 after Plaintiffs' response is filed. Defendants' motion will be
3 taken under submission on the papers. Plaintiffs' failure to
4 comply with this Order will result in the dismissal of their claims
5 for failure to prosecute.

6 The June 2, 2011 hearing on Defendants' motion to dismiss is
7 VACATED.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 Dated: 5/19/2011


CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

² Plaintiffs have filed other actions in this district based
24 on inscrutable pleadings. See generally Robledo v. Bank of
25 America, No. C 11-0237 CW; Robledo v. Bank of America, No. C 11-
26 0238 CW; Robledo v. Bank of America, No. C 11-0240 CW; Robledo v.
27 Bank of America, No. C 11-0241 CW; Robledo v. Bank of America, No.
28 C 11-0242 CW; Robledo v. Bank of America, No. C 11-0243 CW.
Because Plaintiffs' responses to Defendants' motions to dismiss did
not contain any discernible argument, notwithstanding the Court's
warning, these actions were dismissed for failure to prosecute.